

**REMARKS**

This paper is a follow-up to Amendment A, filed on March 15, 2007 in response to the Office Action mailed December 15, 2006 (Paper No. 20061019). The claims have been further amended to more clearly describe the present invention, and are submitted to be in allowable form. No new matter has been added to the application.

Claim 13 has been amended to remove the language “and the like” from the claim, and is respectfully submitted to be in allowable form.

To more clearly define the claimed invention, claims 1 and 26 have been amended to recite a device and a method, respectively, for “measuring the properties of high-gloss or metallic finishes in particular of vehicle bodies”.

Claim 1 has been further amended to recite, among other things, “...said radiation detector means comprising a device suitable for detecting incident radiation dependent on a wavelength of said radiation...” Applicant submits that as amended, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Specifically, in Wiles, the radiation detector 20 receives time-separated beams of light and generates time-separated signals in response to the illumination reflected from measurement surface 10. (Col. 4, ll. 1-5; FIG. 1). The radiation detector 20 in Wiles detects radiation reflected from the face of the surface, but not incident radiation projecting onto the face of the surface and dependent on the wavelength of the radiation, as recited in amended claim 1. Similarly, in Eidelman, the detector or sensor 48 does not include a device for detecting incident radiation


dependent on its wavelength, as recited in amended claim 1. In Schwarz, the detector or sensor device 20 is provided in a housing 10 and includes a plurality of light-sensitive elements 21 linked with photo sensors 22, 23, 24 configured for measuring the surface area elements based on reflected light. Schwarz neither discloses nor suggests the sensor 20 having a device for detecting incident radiation dependent on wavelength, as recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is in allowable form.

Claim 2 has been amended and new claim 31 has been added, incorporating features of claim 2. Applicant respectfully submits that because amended claim 1 is in allowable form, amended claim 2 and new claim 31, which depend from claim 1, are also in allowable form.

In view of the above amendments, the application is respectfully submitted to be in allowable form. Allowance of the rejected claims is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner discover there are remaining issues which may be resolved by a telephone interview, he is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By   
Rebecca L. Pumphrey  
Registration No. 53,713

**Customer No. 24978**  
April 25, 2007  
Suite 2500  
300 S. Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6501  
Telephone: (312) 360-0080  
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315